



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/891,612	06/27/2001	Mamoru Nakasuji	010816	8832
38834	7590	07/09/2004	EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			BERMAN, JACK I	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 700				2881
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/891,612	NAKASUJI ET AL. <i>[Handwritten mark]</i>	
	Examiner	Art Unit	2881
Jack I. Berman			

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 52-93 and 95 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 83 and 84 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 82,85 and 95 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 52-79,81 and 86-93 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 80 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

The substitute specification filed on January 5, 2004 has been entered.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 52-82, 85-93, and 95, drawn to an electron beam testing apparatus, classified in class 250, subclass 310.

II. Claims 83 and 84, drawn to a focus adjusting method for an electron beam apparatus, classified in class 250, subclass 307The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case both conditions are met because the focus adjusting method claimed in Invention II does not require the particular apparatus claimed in Invention I and the electron beam testing apparatus claimed in Invention I can be used without using the focus adjusting method claimed in Invention II.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Newly submitted claims 83 and 84 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the reasons explained above.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution

Art Unit: 2881

on the merits. Accordingly, claims 83 and 84 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 52-54, 60, 68-78, and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. in view of Lo et al. and Davis et al. As was explained in the previous Office action, Yamazaki et al. discloses a sheet beam based testing apparatus characterized by comprising: a testing chamber for an object under testing (not labeled but inherently required because the electron optics used by Yamazaki et al. will only focus electrons into a beam inside a vacuum); a sheet beam generator (1, 2, 3) for emitting charged particles or ions or electromagnetic waves having energy for expelling secondary charge particles from said object (11) under testing held in said testing chamber as a sheet-shaped primary irradiation beam (31a, 31b) having a predetermined width (see lines 54-59 in column 4); an electron-optical

system for introducing (4, 5, 6, 27, 14) said beam (31a, 31b) to said object under testing, and capturing (14, 27, 16, 18, 20) secondary charged particle flux (32a, 32b) generated from said object (11) under testing and introducing said secondary charged particle flux to an image processing system (22, 23, 24, 25); the image processing system (22, 23, 24, 25) for projecting said secondary charge particle flux (32a, 32b) to form a visible image; an information processing system (28, 29) for displaying and/or storing state information of said object under testing based on an output of said image processing system; and a stage (12) for holding said object under testing for relative movement with respect to said electron-optical system. The Yamazaki et al. apparatus includes electrostatic lenses (14, 16, 18, 20), an EXB separator or a Wien filter (27) for separating a secondary charged particle beam emitted from said object under testing from the primary irradiating beam, wherein the amount of deflection of said secondary charged particle beam by a magnetic field of said EXB separator or said Wien filter is twice the amount of deflection by an electric field of the same, and a deflecting direction by said magnetic field is opposite to a deflecting direction by said electric field, and beam deflecting means (4) for forming a primary irradiating beam or deflecting the primary irradiating beam to sequentially irradiate regions under testing on said object under testing with the primary irradiating beam. Yamazaki et al. teaches to use the apparatus disclosed to inspect wafers or semiconductors for defects, which includes defective circuit wires, measurement of line widths, measurement of alignment precision, and measurement of potential contrast. Yamazaki et al. does not teach to use the apparatus disclosed to expose a wafer, but since the apparatus inherently constitutes a type of scanning electron microscope and electron beam lithography devices were originally developed from scanning electron microscopes, it would have been obvious to a person having

ordinary skill in the art to use the Yamazaki et al. apparatus to delineate a circuit pattern of a semiconductor device on a wafer or a reticle. Yamazaki et al. does not teach how the object under test is moved in or out of the (inherently required) testing chamber, how the testing chamber is held at vacuum, to isolate the object under test from vibrations, to precharge the object under test, how the object under test is held, or how the positioning of the object under test is determined. Lo et al. discloses scanning electron beam inspection apparatus similar to Yamazaki et al.'s and teaches at lines 53-60 in column 7 that transport mechanisms for securing an object under testing for transportation into and out of a testing chamber are conventional. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide the Yamazaki et al. apparatus with the conventional transport mechanism cited by Lo et al. At lines 48-53 in column 7, Lo et al. teaches to provide a vibration isolator (50) for preventing vibrations of the object under testing; and a vacuum device (48) for holding the inside of the testing chamber at a vacuum. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide these devices in the Yamazaki et al. apparatus because vibrations would be as detrimental to image resolution in the Yamazaki et al. apparatus as they would be in the Lo et al. apparatus and some means would have to be provided to maintain the vacuum required by both patented apparatuses. At lines 37-55 in column 6, Lo et al. discloses a precharge unit and, beginning at line 48 in column 9, explains in detail how precharging removes variations of charge accumulated on an object under test. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply this teaching of Lo et al.'s to the Yamazaki et al. apparatus in order to prevent the problems discussed by Lo et al. At lines 33-34 in column 7, Lo et al. teaches to use an electrostatic chuck (24) that electrostatically sucks and holds an object to support an object under test (22) and at

lines 4-20 in column 7 Lo et al. teaches to use such a chuck to apply a voltage to the object (22) from a bias source (28) and to increase or decrease this voltage from zero to a predetermined value. Since Yamazaki et al. teaches at 30-35 in column 5 that a predetermined voltage must be applied to the object under test, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the electrostatic chuck cited by Lo et al. to both hold the object and apply the required predetermined voltage. Yamazaki et al. also teaches at lines 31-32 in column 7 that the movement of the stage on which the object under test is held must be controlled by a controller. Since Lo et al. teaches at lines 38-44 in column 7 and lines 38-40 in column 8 that such a controller may comprise a laser interference type distance measuring unit (laser interferometer) for providing feedback to determine the coordinates of the stage, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide such an alignment controller including a laser interferometer as the controller required by Yamazaki et al. At lines 3-17 in column 6, Yamazaki et al. discloses an image processing system having image capturing means that includes a fluorescent screen and a micro-channel plate and a solid-state imager device (CCD) camera to detect secondary charged particles for capturing each of images of a plurality of regions under testing on said object under testing, which images are then sent to an "image data host computer 29 [that] displays an image on a display 30, saves and processes image data, and so forth." Clearly Yamazaki et al. uses a conventional image processor. Lo et al. teaches, at line 63 in column 7 through line 11 in column 8, that such a conventional image processor includes a "die-to-reference" algorithm that, by definition, inherently requires means for storing a reference image and an information processing system for comparing said images of the regions under testing with the reference image to determine a state of said object under testing. It would have

been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the conventional image processor described by Lo et al. as the nominally recited “image data host computer”. It is noted that the limitation in claim 69 that the plurality of images of the regions under testing captured by said image processing means are captured as they are displaced from one another while partially overlapping on said object under testing is a limitation on the method of using the claimed sheet beam testing apparatus, not on the apparatus itself, and therefore can not patentably distinguish the claimed apparatus. While Lo et al. teaches a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide the Yamazaki et al. apparatus with a conventional transport mechanism, including a loading chamber (loadlock subsystem 52), and to provide a vibration isolator (50) for preventing vibrations of the object under testing, neither Yamazaki et al. nor Lo et al. discuss the problem of dust adhering to a wafer as the loading chamber is evacuated. Davis et al. discusses this problem at line 64 in column 10 through line 31 in column 11 and teaches that it occurs whenever wafers are transferred into a vacuum chamber through a loading chamber and further teaches to solve it by supplying a clean gas to the wafer. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply Davis et al.’s solution to this problem, which would inherently occur in the Yamazaki et al./Lo et al. apparatus discussed above, by using Lo et al.’s loadlock subsystem as a mini-environment chamber for supplying a clean gas to said object under testing to prevent dust from attaching to said object under testing. Davis et al. also teaches, at lines 20-27 in column 23, that any number of load lock chambers and processing modules and transfer arms can be provided to deliver wafers between any two chambers in any sequence if desired. The provision of a plurality of loading chambers disposed between the mini-environment chamber discussed above and the testing chamber, each adapted to be independently controllable in a

vacuum atmosphere, a first transport unit for transporting an object under testing between one of the loading chambers and the mini-environment chamber, and a second transport unit for transporting said object under testing between one of said loading chambers and said testing chamber would therefore have been an obvious duplication of parts in accordance with Davis et al.'s suggestion. The amendment filed on April 28, 2004 attempts to distinguish over the previously cited prior art by adding to independent Claim 52 the limitation of "a sensor provided within said mini-environment chamber for observing the cleanliness of said mini-environment chamber" and adding a new dependent Claim 53 that further claims "a shut-down device for shutting down said apparatus when said sensor detects that said cleanliness becomes under a predetermined value." However, these new limitations do not distinguish over the prior art because Davis et al. already discloses such a sensor (particulate sensor 202) in the mini-environment chamber at lines 10-24 in column 24 and further teaches from line 61 in column 27 through line 36 in column 28 to prevent the transfer of specimens into the testing chamber if the number of particulates detected is too high. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include this sensor in the Yamazaki et al./Lo et al./Davis et al. apparatus discussed above for the reasons explained by Davis et al. It would also have been obvious to such a person to shut down the apparatus if the detected particulate count was too high rather than merely attempt another purge as Davis et al. teaches. This would enable the operator to try to find and alleviate the source of contamination rather than to simply remove the particulates without regard for their source.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Lo et al. and Davis et al. as applied to claims 52-54, 60, 68-78, and 86 above, and further in view

Art Unit: 2881

of Bachman. The Yamazaki et al. apparatus has several electrostatic lenses, but these lenses are not described in detail. Bachman, on the other hand, discloses an electrostatic lens including a plurality of electrodes (18, 19) having potential differences, and an insulating material (10) positioned between said electrodes for holding said electrodes, at least one electrode (19) having a first electrode surface having a minimum inter-electrode distance, a second electrode surface having an inter-electrode distance longer than said first electrode surface, and a step between both said electrodes (18, 19); said insulating material (10) being positioned between said second electrode surface and another electrode (18) for substantially vertically supporting each electrode; and a minimum creeping distance of said insulating material between said electrodes is substantially equal to an inter-electrode distance in said supported electrode portion. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the electrostatic lens disclosed by Bachman as at least one of the unspecified electrostatic lenses required by Yamazaki et al. .

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Lo et al., Davis et al., and Bachman as applied to claim 55 above, and further in view of Abe et al. The Bachman apparatus has several electrodes, but the materials of these electrodes are not described in detail. Abe et al., on the other hand, discloses electrodes formed as metal films for use in an electron optical column and teaches, at lines 26-32 in column 4 that the use of platinum as the material of such metal coatings is advantageous because platinum does not react with a plasma used to clean the electron optical column so a problem with charge-up (accumulation of charge on non-conductive deposits on an electrode) does not occur. It would therefore have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use coatings of platinum to form the

required electrodes in the Yamazaki et al./Lo et al./Davis et al./Bachman apparatus in order to avoid charge-up problems in the manner taught by Abe et al.

Claims 57-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Lo et al. and Davis et al. as applied to claims 52-54, 60, 68-78, and 86 above, and further in view of Watanabe et al. Watanabe et al. teaches that scanning electron microscopes face a problem caused by vibrations because such vibrations cause the image formed to vibrate.

Watanabe et al. teaches to solve this problem by providing a scanning electron microscope with a mechanical construction for determining a position of said object under testing at which a primary irradiating beam (2) is emitted, a piezoelectric element (9) for receiving a force from vibrations of said mechanical construction; and a vibration attenuating circuit (17) electrically connected to said piezoelectric element for acting to attenuate output electric energy. According to Watanabe et al., the vibration attenuating circuit drives the piezoelectric element at a resonant frequency of the mechanical construction. By definition, any circuit capable of driving a piezoelectric element at a resonant frequency must be tuned, which inherently requires that an inductive means must be determined with respect to the static capacitance of that element, and since Watanabe et al. does not provide any superconductors, the circuit must also have some resistive elements. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide the Yamazaki et al./Lo et al./Davis et al. apparatus discussed above with Watanabe et al.'s vibration attenuating means in order to avoid the vibration problems discussed by Watanabe et al.

Claims 61, 62, and 65-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Lo et al. and Davis et al. as applied to claims 52-54, 60, 68-78, and 86 above,

and further in view of Petric. As is discussed above, Yamazaki et al. does not give any details about the stage positioning equipment and evacuation devices required for the disclosed sheet beam testing apparatus. Petric discloses a stage (30) for holding an object to be irradiated with a focused electron beam with a degree of freedom at least equal to or more than two with respect to the electron-optical system, said stage (30) comprising a non-contact supporting mechanism by means of hydrostatic bearings (see lines 10-15 in column 8), and a vacuum sealing mechanism (20) through differential pumping, and a partition (20) containing a differential pumping structure is disposed between a location of said object which is irradiated with the beam and a hydrostatic bearing support of said stage for reducing a conductance to produce a pressure difference. At lines 56-59 in column 7, Petric teaches that the surface (9) of parts facing the hydrostatic bearing should be ground to form a flat surface, this grinding inherently constituting a surface treatment that reduces released gases because it removes pits in which gases might be trapped. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the Petric apparatus as the stage positioning equipment and evacuation devices required for the Yamazaki et al./Lo et al./Davis et al. sheet beam testing apparatus since the Petric apparatus is designed to permit the irradiation of objects with a focused electron beam of the type used by Yamazaki et al., Lo et al., and Davis et al. While Petric uses air as the gas supplied to the hydrostatic bearings, the use of dry nitrogen or inert gas would have been an obvious substitution of equivalent materials to exert a hydrostatic gas pressure. It would also have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to exhaust the gas supplied to the hydrostatic bearing from a housing for containing said stage, and thereafter pressurizing the gas and again supplying it to said hydrostatic bearings in order to avoid wasting the gas.

Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Lo et al., Davis et al. and Petric as applied to claims 61, 62, and 65-67 above, and further in view of Lamattina et al. At lines 8-9 in column 4, Lamattina et al. teaches that it is known in the art to use a cold trap to back up a roughing pump and a high vacuum pump. It would therefore have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use such a cold trap in the differential pumping structure that forms a partition in both the Lamattina et al. apparatus (as envelope apparatus 29 and 39) and the Petric apparatus (as envelope 20 and 87) when using this structure to permit the irradiation of the object under test in the Yamazaki et al./Lo et al./Davis et al./Petric apparatus discussed above.

Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Lo et al., Davis et al. and Petric as applied to claims 61, 62, and 65-67 above, and further in view of Bisschops et al. As can be best seen in Figure 4, Bisschops et al. teaches that when a hydrostatic bearing (21) is used to support a stage (14) that supports a wafer (W) inside the vacuum chamber (V) of a lithography system (2), it is advantageous to provide a partition (sliding seal plate 12) near the hydrostatic bearing to minimize loss of vacuum. Since the Petric apparatus uses a hydrostatic bearing as well as a partition near the electron beam generator, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply the teachings of Bisschops et al. by providing an additional partition near the hydrostatic bearing if the Petric apparatus is used as the stage in the Yamazaki et al. sheet beam based testing apparatus in order to maintain the lowest pressure possible at the surface of the wafer under test.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 79 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Murakoshi et al. (Published PCT Application WO99/50651 which is equivalent to U.S. Patent No. 6,476,390). Murakoshi et al. discloses a plural beam-type testing apparatus comprising: a plurality of charged particle beam sources; and a plural beam generator for forming a plurality of charged particle beams and including a partition wall (between the electron gun chamber (101) and the intermediate chamber (102)) disposed to receive said plurality of charged particle beams, said wall having a plurality of holes, each of said holes being disposed in said wall to pass the charged particle beam for a corresponding one of said beam sources. Since the partition wall separates chambers at different pressures and any bowing of the wall would distort the electron optics of the system, it must inherently have a high rigidity (although the term “high” is a relative term and too vague to patentably distinguish the invention in any case).

Claims 87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al., Lo et al., and Davis et al. as applied to claims 52-54, 60, 68-78, and 86 above, and further in view of Livesay. As is discussed above, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the electrostatic chuck cited by Lo et al. to both hold the object and apply the required predetermined voltage in the Yamazaki et al. apparatus. However, Lo et al. does not specify a particular structure for the electrostatic chuck. Livesay discloses an electrostatic chuck comprising an electrode divided into a central portion (28) used to apply a low potential or ground potential to a wafer (11), see lines 3-12 in column 6, and a peripheral

Art Unit: 2881

portion (26) to which a different potential is applied. When a wafer is placed on the chuck, the assembly forms a laminate of a substrate (wafer 11), an electrode (26) and an insulating material (dielectric sheet 25), wherein the wafer is applied with a voltage through a predetermined resistor (the resistance inherent in the contact (28) and the wiring connecting the contact to the voltage source (32)) and a contact (28), said contact (28) having a shape such that its leading end comes in contact with a back surface of said object under testing. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use Livesay's electrostatic chuck as the unspecified electrostatic chuck suggested by Lo et al. The use of some of the peripheral portion (26) of the electrode instead of Livesay's connecting arm underneath and isolated from the peripheral portion to connect the central portion (28) of the electrode to the voltage source would have been an obvious substitution of equivalent parts. In the amendment filed on April 28, 2004, Applicant attempted to distinguish over the prior art by adding the limitation that the apparatus comprises "a controller for controlling said voltage source to cause a voltage to be applied to said object to be gradually deepened to reach to a predetermined value during a predetermined period."

According to the remarks accompanying the amendment: "Lo et al. does not disclose this limitation. If the voltage applies to the object under test is steeply deepened, the transistors or capacities in the object may be harmed." This argument is not convincing because the term "gradual" is vague and undefined and there is no evidence that the Lo et al. apparatus changes the voltage so quickly that the objects under test are harmed because Lo et al. does not specify a rate at which to change the voltage. The new limitation of a controller that gradually deepens the voltage applied to the object therefore is a vague limitation that attempts to solve a problem that only exists if a person tried to operate the Yamazaki et al./Lo et al./Davis et al. apparatus in a

way not taught by any of the prior art. Such a solution to a nonexistent problem cannot patentably distinguish an invention.

Claims 90-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki et al. At lines 30-35 in column 5, Yamazaki et al. teaches to provide the patented sheet beam testing apparatus with a retarding voltage applying unit (power supply 13) for applying said object under testing with a retarding voltage. The value of the voltage to be applied to the sample 11 must be determined on the basis of the resolving performance of the mapping projection optical system. This inherently involves applying varying retarding voltages to the object under test and, based on the magnitude of a distorted pattern or a blurred pattern at a particular site in the image of said object under testing, evaluating the charging state of the object and adjusting the retarding voltage applied to the object so as to achieve the finest resolution. Nothing in Yamazaki et al. precludes forming this testing image near a boundary where a pattern density largely varies on said object under testing which is applied with a plurality of retarding voltages. In the remarks accompanying the amendment filed on April 28, 2004, Applicant argues that the prior art does not disclose a “controller including a charge-up checking unit for measuring a charge-up state of said object and a determination unit for determining an optimal retarding voltage on the basis of the output of said charge-up checking function unit to thereby enabling said retarding voltage applying unit to apply said optimum retarding voltage to said object.” This argument is not convincing because, as is explained above, Yamazaki et al. teaches to determine the voltage to be applied to the sample on the basis of the resolving performance of the mapping projection optical system, which inherently involves applying varying retarding voltages to the object under test and, based on the magnitude of a distorted pattern or a blurred pattern at a

particular site in the image of said object under testing, evaluating the charging state of the object and adjusting the retarding voltage applied to the object so as to achieve the finest resolution.

Yamazaki et al. does not specify a means for making this evaluation, but it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to provide some such means since the evaluation could not be done without using some means. Such means would, by definition, constitute the claimed controller.

Claims 82, 85, and 95 are allowed.

Claim 80 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: As was explained in the previous Office action with respect to Claim 18, the prior art does not teach to provide a sheet beam testing apparatus with an electrostatic objective lens comprising two electrodes and a control mechanism for changing the voltage on one electrode to largely (i.e. coarsely or roughly) change the focal distance of the lens and to the other electrode to change the focal distance of the lens in a short time (i.e. to finely control the focus of the lens) as is now claimed in Claim 85; with respect to Claims 82 and 95, Applicant's argument that the prior art does not disclose an EXB separator that uses a magnetic field that deflects a charged particle twice as much as does the electric field or that deflects one of the primary beam or the secondary beam about 3 times as much as the other beam is convincing; and with respect to Claim 80, the

prior art does not teach to offset the holes in the partition wall from the irradiating axes of the corresponding beam sources.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack I. Berman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2468. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) with every second Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John R. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2477. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Jack I. Berman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2881

jb
7/7/04